



Open Ended Working Group (OEWG)

Multi-Year Programme of Work (MYPoW)

## Compilation of inputs concerning possible HLPE reports for 2018 and 2019

### I. INTRODUCTION

This document is intended to present the proposals submitted by the OEWG members concerning possible themes of the HLPE reports for the next biennium.

As agreed at the MYPoW meeting held on 18 March, OEWG members are invited to indicate to the CFS Secretariat their preferred two proposals in ranked order of priority by 20 May.

Based on the inputs received, a Chair's proposal will then be circulated by 3 June as a basis for the discussion at the MYPoW OEWG meeting on 20 June, where consensus has to be found on the proposal to be presented at CFS 43 in October.

According to the agreed OEWG workplan, the CFS Plenary this year is expected to endorse the themes and scope of the HLPE reports for 2018 and possibly for 2019.

### II. PROPOSED THEMES

The following proposed themes reflect the inputs submitted by the OEWG members. In order to facilitate the work of the OEWG and help its members take an informed decision, CFS stakeholders were requested to elaborate clear proposals that addressed all the criteria in the agreed guidance note for selection of CFS activities and present a strong justification. Some of the proposals below followed this request while others are less detailed and do not present all the requested information. In case there is interest among OEWG members about those less detailed proposals, it would be important that they try to expand them by adding the required information in order to ensure consistency with the other ones and facilitate the work of the OEWG.

Furthermore, please bear in mind that at the last MYPoW OEWG meeting, it was recognized that the decision concerning future HLPE reports could be influenced by the work of the SDGs OEWG. In this regard, indications about possible additional proposals are expected to be provided shortly by the SDGs OEWG.

## A. Inequalities in Agriculture-related Assets as a Key Determinant of Food Insecurity

Hunger has historically been associated with poverty. Poverty is still the main cause of hunger, but the causes of food insecurity are in fact complex and multifaceted, as pointed out in the HLPE Note on Critical and Emerging Issues for FSN of 2014, as well as in several HLPE reports.<sup>1</sup> Poverty is often the result of the superimposition of inequalities of various kinds.

Most attention is typically paid to income inequalities, but unequal distribution of physical and human assets tend to be key determinants of why some have much better income and employment opportunities than others. Profound inequalities in endowments of and access to agriculture-related assets, such as land, water, forests, and livestock, form constraints to improving agricultural productivity and limit income growth and hence access to food for many of the world's poor that directly depend on agriculture for their livelihoods. Such asset inequalities exist between countries, and inside countries, between households and individuals. The main compensation for a country whose natural resources do not allow it "naturally" to grow enough food, is to invest to increase, by various means, its intensity of production or to buy some food from abroad, both options being very difficult to realize if other economic activities do not generate enough income. Inequality in the distribution of agriculture-related assets itself will limit productivity growth, however. This applies, for instance, where limited access of smallholders to land means farm units are too small for efficient production or where intensification of production is constrained by inadequate access to water.

Securing land tenure and improving access to water and other resources, especially for smallholder and landless families can be key to improving sustainable income opportunities in rural areas. Population pressures and lack of access to land are leading to further fragmentation of landholdings, especially in regions where food insecurity is highest.<sup>2</sup> There are also amplifying effects of environmental degradation, including land erosion, and vulnerability to climate change, because of reduced resilience, and hence on the sustainability of agriculture.

Addressing inequalities in natural resource related assets could contribute to conflict prevention and peace building. Dispossession of or limited access to natural resource assets are cited among the key

---

<sup>1</sup> See HLPE (2014) *Note on Critical and Emerging Issues for Food Security and Nutrition*; HLPE (2011). *Price volatility and food security*; HLPE (2012a) *Social protection for food security*; HLPE (2012b) *Food security and climate change*; HLPE (2013). *Investing in smallholder agriculture for food security*; HLPE (2014a) *Food losses and waste in the context of sustainable food systems*; and HLPE (2014b) *Sustainable fisheries and aquaculture for food security and nutrition*. All refer to reports by the High Level Panel of Experts on Food Security and Nutrition of the Committee on World Food Security. Rome.

<sup>2</sup> See e.g. S. Haggblade, P. Hazell and T. Reardon (eds.) (2007) *Transforming the Rural Nonfarm Economy*. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore; P. Hazell (2013) *Comparative Study of trends in Urbanization and Changes in Farm Size in Africa and Asia*, Paper prepared for ISPC, Rome; HLPE (2013) *Investing in smallholder agriculture for food security*, A Reports by the High Level Panel of Experts on Food Security and Nutrition of the Committee on World Food Security. Rome; and FAO (2014) *The State of Food and Agriculture: Innovation in Family Farming*, Rome.

sources of conflict and civil strife, indirectly causing distress migration and displacements of people.<sup>3</sup> Competition over land and water are likely to increase with climate change, as droughts and floods will affect their quality and availability, and further enhance the risk of conflict, especially where inequality is already high.

Insufficient attention has been paid to how these different dimensions of asset inequality in agriculture interact with each other to affect global and local food security in all its different dimensions (availability, access, utilization and stability). The links with peace and security and its implications for peacebuilding efforts and addressing migration and refugee problems equally tend to be overlooked in policy responses.

In light of this, it is proposed that a 2018 HLPE report takes stock of new evidence, new challenges, and provide policy-relevant, evidence-based advice around the following:

- ✓ To what extent are agriculture-related asset inequalities limiting agricultural productivity growth and putting global food security at risk? How much will reducing such inequalities contribute to food security in all of its four dimensions?
- ✓ To what extent are agriculture-related asset inequalities enhancing the risks of climate change impacts and limiting capacities to adopt sustainable agricultural practices and sustainable management of water?
- ✓ How would a less unequal distribution of agricultural asset inequalities contribute to conflict prevention and peace building?
- ✓ How can existing frameworks, such as the Voluntary Guidelines for Land Tenure, Fisheries and Forests and the CFS Principles for Responsible Investments in Agriculture and Food Systems, be leveraged to address inequalities in agriculture-related assets?
- ✓ What lessons can be drawn from the experience of countries in trying to substantially reduce such inequalities? What recommendations could be drawn from such experiences for the means of implementation to achieve the sustainable development goals?

### **CFS value added and contribution to CFS objectives**

CFS is uniquely positioned to address this issue, because of its mandate, its ability to bridge between a scientific discussion on the issue and a multi-stakeholder political and practice-informed discussion, and the fact that it already has a sound basis to build on in the form of the previous HLPE reports. It would be important for CFS to consider the challenge of reducing asset inequalities in agriculture to further operationalize the Voluntary Guidelines for Land Tenure, Fisheries and Forests and the CFS Principles for Responsible Investments in Agriculture and Food Systems, as well as for the Framework for Action for Food Security in Protracted Crises and CFS's work on integrating climate change into food security and nutrition strategies

### **Relevance and global impact**

---

<sup>3</sup> See FAO (2016) *Peace, Conflict and Food Security: What do we know about the linkages?*, Technical Note, FAO, Rome.

Pervasive asset inequalities may pose a threat to efforts to end hunger, achieve food security and making agriculture sustainable; hence to achieving SDG2. However, they may also act as impediments to several other goals of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, especially goals 1 (end poverty), 5 (gender equality), 6 (sustainable water management), 8 (inclusive growth), 10 (reduce inequality), 13 (combat climate change), 15 (sustainable use of eco-systems), and 16 (promote peaceful societies). The world is witnessing the largest refugee flows since World War II and a fair number can be attributed directly or indirectly to conflicts triggered by discontent over dispossession of agricultural assets or lack of access to them. This workstream would contribute to identify integrated policy approaches given the interdependency of asset inequalities with so many of the dimensions of the international development agenda.

### **No duplication**

The proposed approach provides a different perspective. It would contribute to bridge the gap between scientific assessments and the policy discourse. The report is not supposed to duplicate the relevant work done by other bodies and institutions given also the characteristics of this process, such as the inclusive and participatory research approach and the capacity of CFS to specify the areas it wishes to see addressed to maximise the relevance of the report for CFS work.

### **Knowledge and evidence**

Issues of asset inequality in agriculture mostly are studied in isolation on specific dimensions (say, land or water resources). Insufficient attention has been paid to how those dimensions interact with each other and how they could affect global and local food security in all its different dimensions (availability, access, utilization and stability). Likewise, the links with peace and security and its implications for peacebuilding efforts and addressing migration and refugee problems equally tend to be overlooked in policy responses.

### **Rome-based agencies support**

All the three RBAs are engaged on this theme which represents a priority area of focus with major impact on their work.

### **Available resources**

Extra-budgetary funding would be required – the HLPE is 100% voluntarily funded, through a Multi-Donor Trust Fund, at an average cost of \$1.4 million per year.

## **B. The Impacts of School-Feeding Programmes with Local Procurement on Food Security and Nutrition**

Brazil's experience in fighting food insecurity and malnutrition through a national school feeding programme, in conjunction with public procurement, has contributed to Brazil being removed from FAO's Hunger Map in 2014. The school feeding programme in Brazil is an element of the food security policy framework aimed at reducing the number of malnourished children and improving

school enrolment rates. Since 2009, a national law has provided that a minimum of 30% of food purchases to school feeding must to come from family farmers.

In 2011, WFP and Brazil established a Centre of Excellence against Hunger, in Brasilia, to support governments in Africa, Asia and Latin America in the development of sustainable solutions against hunger, mainly through school feeding programmes. To this day, it has received more than 70 delegations from the developing world interested in learning about the Brazilian experience.

Moreover, Brazil has developed other initiatives which have allowed developing countries to learn from the Brazilian experience and adapt it to their local realities. For instance, the Purchase for Africa from Africans Program (PAA Africa), a Brazil-United Kingdom-FAO-WFP project, has provided capacity building to five African countries since 2012 as well as helped them to provide smallholders with access to public procurement related to school feeding programmes. Another example is the Strengthening School Feeding Programmes in Latin America and the Caribbean, in which FAO and Brazil have helped governments to devise their own solutions for providing better, healthier and more diversified school meals to schoolchildren, while at the same time improving the livelihoods of family farmers.

This has demonstrated the importance of school feeding role as a public policy, not only for improving child nutrition and education, but also given its important impacts on local development when connected with a local procurement system.

CFS, as the foremost inclusive international and intergovernmental platform aiming at reducing hunger and malnutrition and enhancing food security and nutrition is well suited for scaling up the debate on school feeding and its impacts on FSN. CFS could feed on its expertise in promoting nutrition and smallholders produce, while simultaneously encouraging policy convergence and global coordination on this matter.

An HLPE Report on “The impacts of school feeding programmes with local procurement on FSN” could, therefore, provide stakeholders with an evidence-based study which may be of great value to a wide-range of countries and other stakeholders struggling to overcome malnutrition and to provide better living conditions and opportunities to smallholders. Although many of the solutions may be mainly local, a global study on the matter would serve as an appropriate common reference for all countries that are developing or enhancing sustainable school feeding programmes. Also, the resulting outcome of such an exercise, be it policy recommendations, voluntary guidelines or guiding principles, would be a major asset to the international fight against hunger and malnutrition and the achievement of the SDGs.

## C. Agroecology for Food Security and Nutrition

### Introduction

"The global food system is at a crossroads", that of "ending hunger and malnutrition in a socially, economically and environmentally sustainable way". This statement is included in the regional meeting information notes on agroecology, put forward for consideration at FAO regional conferences<sup>4</sup>.

Regional meetings<sup>5</sup> jointly organised by the FAO, governments, civil society organisations and academic institutions, as part of the process initiated by the FAO in September 2014 through the international symposium<sup>6</sup>, brought together almost 600 representatives in total, from government institutions, UN agencies, regional multilateral institutions, civil society organisations (including small-scale food producer organisations, INGOs and NGOs), research and innovation institutions, development institutes, universities and the private sector.

A clear message came out of these meetings: agroecological systems offer greater capacity for overcoming the challenges of the current crossroads that the global food system finds itself in, given that they provide solutions which are applied to each context with a capacity to combine knowledge, praxis and local innovation with scientific knowledge, while guaranteeing the sustainable use of natural resources.

Through agroecology, "indigenous peoples, local communities and family farmers can overcome hunger and malnutrition while building resilience to adapt to climate change in a sustainable way through agro-ecological food systems supported by conducive policies, adequate legislation, investment, knowledge sharing, research and innovation."<sup>7</sup>.

The aforementioned information notes state that agroecology:

- Plays an essential role in ensuring food and nutrition security, guaranteeing the human right to adequate food, improving equality, eradicating poverty and diversifying diets, all in a way which is suited to each culture and which promotes local food customs and traditional knowledge.
- Recognises the central role of women in laying the right social foundations and fostering knowledge which allow for sustainable food systems to develop.
- Promotes practices that allow young people to constantly regenerate knowledge, values, vision and leadership, which is all fundamentally important in moving towards food systems which are more sustainable.
- Prevents environmental degradation and pollution, fostering greater resilience in food systems and thus making it easier to adapt to the negative impacts of climate change.

---

<sup>4</sup> LARC/16/INF/13; ARC/16/INF/20; APRC/16/INF/8 Rev.1

<sup>5</sup> 2. For further information please see: <http://www.fao.org/americas/eventos/ver/en/c/287503/>  
<http://www.fao.org/africa/events/detail---events/en/c/330741/>  
<http://www.fao.org/asiapacific/events/detail--events/en/c/1262/>

<sup>6</sup> 3. The final report of the International Symposium on Agroecology for Food Security and Nutrition is available at: <http://www.fao.org/3/a---i4327e.pdf>

<sup>7</sup> LARC/16/INF/13

- Reduces food loss and food waste, promoting integrated agricultural systems and resource saving which also shortens the value chain by building strong links between small-scale food producers and consumers as well as between economies and local markets.

As pointed out by José Graziano da Silva, FAO Director-General, at the international symposium on agroecology for food security and nutrition, held in Rome in September 2014, agroecology offers win-win solutions which raise productivity, improve the capacity to recover and which make a more efficient use of natural resources.

In short, agroecology provides concrete solutions for governments in promoting a transition towards sustainable food systems. An enabling policy environment is therefore fundamental. All that is required is courage and political will to promote actions which are responsible towards future generations.

### **CFS added value and contributions to CFS objectives**

The CFS, as the primary global space for promoting policy convergence on food security and nutrition, in honour of its founding principles and thanks to its capacity for building a synthesis between scientific discussions and multi-stakeholder political and practice-informed discussions, plays a fundamental role in promoting solutions for overcoming the crossroads that the global food system currently finds itself in.

As acknowledged by regional seminars, agroecology is one of the best alternatives for achieving food and nutrition security. Furthermore, it is an area in which several different stakeholders (CSOs, academics, national food and agricultural agencies, policy-makers and different constituencies in some countries) have accumulated the necessary knowledge and experience to contribute to a HLPE report and to discuss its outcomes with a view to reaching agreements on CFS actions and recommendations on food and nutrition security.

An important added value of the CFS would be that of contributing to an exhaustive and up-to-date analysis of research and evidence accumulated thus far in the field through a HLPE report and by subsequently carrying out political deliberations and agreeing on specific recommendations for relevant public policies.

Furthermore, this proposal contributes to the CFS mandate of supporting national capacity to formulate policy for transitioning towards sustainable food systems, overcoming hunger and malnutrition and moving towards the progressive realization of the right to adequate food.

### **Relevance and global impact**

Agroecology is ever more present in intergovernmental body discussions and it is a topic which comes up repeatedly at the CFS as well, particularly given the great importance it holds for food and nutrition security. Agroecology has become a reference point which is increasingly present in proposals for alternatives to current unsustainable models for production, consumption and sales and it is an incredibly important perspective in seeking out new concepts and methods for tackling the effects of climate change and addressing how it exacerbates food insecurity and malnutrition.

Family farming and agroecology are intimately linked when it comes to achieving food and nutrition security which is sustainable on the ground. "Family farming, the practice which agroecology is based on, involves at least 500 million family farms worldwide."<sup>8</sup>.

### **No Duplication**

This proposal does not run the risk of doubling up on relevant work carried out by other bodies and institutions, but rather represents an innovative approach which, given the characteristics of the CFS, will allow for expertise to be fostered and agreements reached through scientific and political dialogue which is inclusive and participatory, thus building the capacity of national governments to develop and promote necessary public policy for a transition towards sustainable food systems which foster food and nutrition security.

### **Knowledge and evidence**

As stated in information notes from regional meetings on agroecology, over the last decade there has been an exponential rise in research on agroecology and agroecological practices as well as a rise in research on how to implement policies which provide the necessary support.

It is therefore clear that there is a huge wealth of experience, expertise and knowledge accumulated by generations of small-scale food producers across the continents. There is also a wealth of analysis and programs from governmental and intergovernmental bodies on the topic and there are new studies coming from the world of academia and several contributions from other sectors in society and the economy.

A HLPE report would offer an exhaustive and up-to-date analysis of existing evidence, thus building the basis for a political deliberation process within the CFS.

### **Support from Rome-based agencies**

The Rome-based agencies are well placed to provide technical support to the topic. As referred above, FAO has played a leading role to broaden the knowledge on agroecology, in close cooperation with the other RBA, and to convene the expertise of government institutions, other UN agencies, civil society, research and innovation institutions, universities and the private sector. Agroecology was also prominently discussed at the IFAD Farmers Forums in 2014 and 2016. The Forums appreciated the ongoing efforts of IFAD on this topic and requested IFAD to strengthen its support to agroecological training and communication initiatives undertaken by small-scale producers' organizations, and to strengthen coherence and synergies with other agencies, particularly FAO, and governments.

---

<sup>8</sup> LARC/16/INF/13

## D. Coherence in the Global Governance of Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture to Food Security and Nutrition

### **Background information regarding each proposed topic together with strong justification of food security and nutrition policy aspects**

Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (GRFA) are an important component of agricultural biodiversity, which underpins the food system and is essential for realising the Right to Food. The governance of genetic resources takes place in multiple international bodies – some of them under the UN system and some of them not – with different rules of decision-making and with different interests<sup>9</sup>. Reviewing, in the CFS context, the specific contribution of each of these bodies' policies and regulations to the role of genetic resources for improving food security and nutrition would be important for providing greater guidance on how these bodies could better contribute to food security and nutrition. It would also improve policy coherence among them, something which is currently lacking. Diverse, locally adapted seeds and breeds, selected, developed and conserved in situ and on-farm under local growing conditions, are essential to ensure the possibility of adapting to future climate changes and to promoting resilience. While some governance structures promote sustainable use of seeds on-farm, others restrict peasant farmers' access to GRFA and gene banks and promote varieties under some form of intellectual property, developed for industrial monocultures. These varieties cannot be used for selection and development of new and better adapted populations / varieties. Meanwhile, farmers are organising themselves to improve their access to seeds: Farmers' organisations/ CSOs report a surge of autonomous local and regional initiatives in community-based seed systems, which increase the exchange of seeds, knowledge and experience, locally and at intra- and cross-regional levels.

### **Description of how the topic contributes to CFS objectives and mandate as well as explanation of the value add/rationale for the Committee addressing this matter**

#### **CFS MANDATE and VALUE ADDED:**

Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture and wider agricultural biodiversity underpin a resilient model of food production that contributes to enhancing food security and nutrition for all human beings. Since there is currently a deep incoherence in the governance of genetic resources for food agriculture and a proliferation of different governance regimes dealing with the issue, the CFS is the only body that has the mandate to convene a process that could improve policy coherence and coordination in order to enhance food security and nutrition.

#### **CONTRIBUTION TO CFS OVERALL OBJECTIVE:**

---

<sup>9</sup> For example, the UN system includes the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Nagoya Protocol, the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture and the Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture. The World Intellectual Property Organisation is a self-funding agency of the United Nations. Outside the UN system, there is the International Union for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants (UPOV).

Through improving the coherence of the global governance of genetic resources for food and agriculture, the issue would address two of the three overall objectives of the CFS:

(A): “Enhanced global coordination on food security and nutrition questions”

There is a lack of coherence by the various governance regimes where decisions are made about genetic resources for food and agriculture. Furthermore there is a need to include farmers' organizations and other small--scale food producers in these governance spaces as meaningful participants (currently they are allowed in as observers, if at all).

(B): “Improved policy convergence on key food security and nutrition issues”

Decisions on the governance of genetic resources for food and agriculture and wider agricultural biodiversity are taken by different institutions (the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGRFA), FAO Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture, Convention on Biological Diversity, UPOV, and the World Intellectual Property Organization). There is no coordination between them since it is not questioned that that each has no right to encroach on the prerogatives of the other. The final outcome is a confusing, contradictory and inefficient global strategy to conserve, sustainably use and develop agricultural biodiversity, and , inter alia, to improve access to these resources by small--scale food producers and strengthen farmers' rights over their seeds (as required under article 6 and article 9 of ITPGRFA).

**RELEVANCE AND GLOBAL IMPACT:**

Genetic resources are one of the fundamental and always necessary resources for producing food and for achieving food security and nutrition. This is true of all production systems and in all regions of the world. Food producers rely on genetic resources not only as the basis of their production but also for direct consumption and nutrition.

**NO DUPLICATION:**

While some of the above--named institutions provide reports to each other's governing bodies and working structures, this has not led to increased policy convergence and coherence. For example; restricted access to, and reduced diversity of, GRFA facilitated by some of the organisations conflicts with the need for increasing agricultural biodiversity in agro--ecosystems favoured by others.

**KNOWLEDGE AND EVIDENCE:**

The numerous challenges in coherence and effectiveness of various governance mechanisms over PGR are examined in depth by many experts. For example:

- Halewood, M. et. al. 2013, Crop Genetic Resources as a Global Commons: Challenges in International Law and Governance, Earthscan.
- “Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture and Farmers' Rights: an analysis of the relationship between the Nagoya Protocol and related instruments” (C. Chiarolla, S. Louafi,

M. Schloen) in *The Nagoya Protocol in Perspective: Implications for International Law and Implementation Challenges* (Brill/Martinus Nijhoff: 2013).

- Berne Declaration 2014, *Owning Seeds, Accessing Food: A Human Rights Impact Assessment Of UPOV 1991 Based on Case Studies in Kenya, Peru and the Philippines*).

#### **ROME-BASED AGENCIES SUPPORT:**

FAO is the main RBA working specifically on PGR, but both IFAD and WFP are also very concerned with issues such as the impacts of climate change on PGR, livelihoods and nutritional aspects, etc.

## **E. The Impact of Trade Agreements on Food Security and Nutrition**

### **Background, Relevance and Global Impact**

International trade agreements have been acknowledged to have a significant and complex impact on Food Security and Nutrition (FSN). Those in favour of trade liberalisation have long argued that trade agreements in removing barriers to food trade increase food system efficiency and encourage greater productivity and use of resources, and allow food to flow where it is most in demand.

Critics of trade agreements point to the fact that while trade agreements have helped the spread of particularly high-yield refined carbohydrates that have increased food security, the spread and reliance on such food crops as wheat and sugar has simplified diets and undermined nutrition. Crucially, trade agreements in the main do not cover or consider the impact on small-scale food producers, including pastoralists, fishersfolk and family farms, yet they are argued to be often the most adversely impacted by such agreements, while providing more than 70% of global food supply and thus being critical to food security and nutrition.

A recent trend in trade negotiations has been the Regional Trade Agreements (RTAs) including 'mega' RTAs such as the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement & TTIP currently under negotiation, as well as bilateral trade agreements. Unlike previous trade agreements that largely focus on removing tariff barriers, RTAs instead focus on creating agreed single standards overriding internal state policy and legal frameworks for issues including safety and health standards, rules for foreign investment and intellectual property, essential services such as telecommunications, and labour and environmental protections. RTAs also then contain clauses that allow state laws and regulation that impede foreign investment, access to market and profit-making to be challenged and fines or compensation enforced. These include public good laws and have direct implications for FSN. For example states have been ordered to pay compensation and desist from legal measures that protect water catchments from mining; or cease local procurement as a means of stimulating resilient and robust internal economies.

Therefore there are longstanding issues regarding traditional bilateral and multilateral trade agreements, and multi-lateral negotiations through the WTO with regard to the impact on FSN; and potential new impacts from RTAs which are increasingly used since the collapse of global trade

negotiations. In both instances these impacts will be global given the comprehensiveness of these trade agreements.

The reliance on international trade as a means for countries with limited or no domestic food security was also shown to be problematic during the global food crisis of 2008--09. Some major food exporters simply stopped and social unrest and disruption due to high food prices and scarcity was widespread in more than 40 countries. It is clear that many countries are now acting to effectively bypass trade as the sole means of ensuring their own food security. These measures include the creation of public stock--holdings for food security, operational at the national level and proposed in the regional level, in line with the recommendations of successive UN Special Rapporteurs on the Right to Food.

It is therefore timely and critical to consider the impact of traditional trade agreements on FSN; and to consider likely impacts from RTAs, in order to provide advice to governments and other actors regarding appropriate mechanisms and pitfalls in both styles multi--lateral, regional and bilateral trade agreements that may be having an adverse impact on the desired goals of achieving global food security and adequate nutrition. It is particularly timely given that the role of small--scale food producers is increasingly recognised as the key to global FSN, focusing on building resilience and adaptability in world confronted with the challenge of climate change. The potential imposed and extended rigidity of trade agreements on local responses by state actors to FSN is a timely topic.

### **CFS Added Value**

The CFS is uniquely placed to consider the impact of trade agreements on FSN. No other body in the international system is charged with undertaking the required complex synthesis of information and evidence to assess the impact of major global trends and policies on food security and nutrition, and discuss more specifically the impact of trade agreements on the attainment of food security and nutrition and the ways to promote coherence with the progressive realization of the right to adequate food.

The High--Level Panel of experts of the CFS is best placed and equipped to provide a sound analytic basis for an in--depth discussion among all relevant actors working on food security, present in the CFS. In such context, the CFS can play its role to promote policy convergence on an issue that is sensitive and contentious, but certainly highly relevant to food security and nutrition on the national, regional and global level.

Further, the work of the CFS demonstrably touches on the role of trade and the needs of state actors to respond to achieving aspects of FSN, which in turn are influenced by trade agreements. In this sense, this proposal is strongly linked to, and following--up on past and ongoing CFS workstreams, such as on responsible governance of tenure rights, investment in smallholder agriculture, responsible agricultural investment or connecting smallholders to markets.

### **Duplication**

Currently, there is no equivalent analysis undertaken within international trade legal frameworks. By focusing the assessment on food security and nutrition as the core mandate of the CFS, there will be no duplication with the processes and negotiations conducted under the auspices of multilateral or regional trade institutions. The analysis would be entirely complementary to the discussions being currently held in trade bodies and inform the negotiations better, especially with regard to the impact of FSN. The Nairobi Ministerial Declaration of the Tenth WTO ministerial with regard to the future of the Doha Development Round (DDR), has opened up the space for this discussion in other forums including the CFS.

### **Knowledge and evidence**

There is a considerable body of knowledge to draw upon regarding the implications of trade agreements for global and regional food security and nutrition, both in terms of documenting positive and negative outcomes for FSN. In addition to the data and information collected by the international institutions including the Rome---Based Agencies, there is a considerable amount of literature and analysis of existing bilateral and multilateral trade agreements and their impact on food security and nutrition by academic, civil society and state actors.

### **Rome-Based Agencies Support**

The Rome---based agencies are well placed to provide technical support. The FAO's work in collecting trade data, the work of the WFP on issues such as trade for aid, and IFAD's work on rural development and resilience mean they are well-placed to inform this proposed report of the HLPE and the subsequent assessment process within the CFS.

## **F. The Increasing Role of Financial Markets in Food Security and Nutrition**

(as per HLPE note of 6/8/2014).

Whatever themes will be selected by the OEWG for future HLPE reports, we expect that a certain flexibility can be maintained until the next session of CFS (October 2016) in order to take into account the best way to contribute to the review process on SDGs implementation under the HLPF. An evidence-based input from the CFS to the follow-up and review process of the Agenda 2030 is a unique opportunity to make the voice of this Committee heard among the whole UN-family. It is thus a contribution not only to the cause of food security, but also to system-wide coherence.

## **G. Sustainable Consumption**

Sustainable consumption and the possibilities to discuss on food trade policies and value chains for food security and nutrition, but it is also important to re-address the issue of food losses and waste, considering that no additional documents/activities have been produced since 2014's Report. In this regard, it will be fine if the OEWG decides either to consider the request on FLW as a part of the

proposition made on sustainable consumption, or instead as a separate petition that will also lead us to a separate follow-up product.

## H. Multi-stakeholder partnerships to finance food security and nutrition in the framework of the Agenda 2030

The 2030 agenda for sustainable development comprises the SDGs, as well as the commitments on climate change (COP21), and the greatly expanded agenda for international cooperation defined by the outcome of the Third International Conference on Financing for Development: the Addis Ababa Action Agenda (AAAA). The AAAA recognizes nutrition, agriculture and rural development together with ending hunger as one broad area where more and better investments, underpinned by adequate financing, are needed and could yield cross-cutting benefits for sustainable development.

To achieve the ambitious goals set in Agenda 2030, multi-stakeholder partnerships are expected to play an increasingly relevant role in its implementation, as fully recognised in SDG 17 'Strengthen the means of implementation and revitalise the global partnership for sustainable development'. Partnerships are important vehicles for mobilising and sharing experiences, technology, knowledge, and resources to successfully implement the SDGs, especially in relation to food security, nutrition and sustainable agriculture.

The effectiveness, quality and impact of development financing need to be improved in order to meet current food security and nutrition needs in the context of the Agenda 2030. In this connection, partnerships also appear promising in order to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of development finance. The partnerships are multi-stakeholder in nature, bringing together partners from national governments, humanitarian and development actors, donors, foundations, civil society and the private sector at both national and international levels..

In light of these elements, the HLPE could take stock of new evidence, analyse trends, identify new opportunities and challenges and provide recommendations that could result in evidence based policy guidance, in connection to partnerships in relation to financing for food security and nutrition. This topic would include attention to resource mobilization for financing food security and nutrition from all main sources, namely domestic public and private resources; external private resources (both profit and non-profit); and external public resources from ODA (Official Development Aid), in various partnership combinations. It should also look at the effectiveness of such partnerships in reaching FSN objectives. The report should further explore how partners can enhance their cooperation through establishing fully functioning partnerships in which multiple stakeholders work together for shared objectives, looking especially at:

- CFS like partnerships/platforms at country level to address food security and nutrition issues and help countries implement CFS products
- Public-Private-Producers Partnerships for sustainable agriculture

- Partnerships involving the UN: UN led partnerships, multi-stakeholders partnerships including UN agencies for food security and nutrition purposes
- Partnerships with multilateral development finance institutions, including those involved in *Private Sector Investment Operations*, in particular on how to improve medium and small agribusinesses' access to finance.
- Partnerships involving farmer organisations, farmer associations and cooperatives
- Partnerships involving (philanthropic) foundations for food security and nutrition and sustainable agriculture
- FSN Partnerships that particularly aim at 'leaving no one behind'

By developing this report, the CFS would be contributing to the global effort to implement the SDGs by linking SDGs related to FSN (SDG2 and others) with SDG17, and by drawing attention to promising partnerships that can enhance the amount and effectiveness of finance for FSN.

### **CFS value added and contribution to CFS objectives**

The CFS, the most prominent global multi-stakeholder “platform” within the UN system, is uniquely positioned to address this issue, because of its mandate, its ability to bridge scientific discussions with a multi-stakeholder political and practice-informed discussion.

Research into partnerships requires a multi-disciplinary approach for which the HLPE is particularly suitable.

As UNSGSC Nabarro reports, SDGs are undividable and interdependent and their implementation will require collective efforts, seeking for new financing sources as well as making better use of existing ones. Building new partnerships among a wide range of actors, including civil society, private sector, governments, philanthropic institutions, academia and others, is needed to achieve this ambitious common aim. The CFS, given its multi-stakeholder nature, is well positioned to contribute to the necessary debate around establishing partnerships for financing the Agenda 2030 and closing the gap, especially in connection to sustainable agriculture, food security and nutrition and in advancing the parts of the Agenda within its mandate. The report will provide scientific evidence that can be complemented by the diverse views, experiences and concerns of different partners and constituencies directly affected by food security and nutrition challenges.

### **Relevance and global impact**

The 2030 Agenda places 'partnerships' as one of the core elements to achieve its goals and meet the commitments made by world leaders to ending poverty and hunger in all their dimensions. In this respect, this topic raises relevant issues for financing food security and nutrition and sustainable agriculture, as acknowledged by the AAAA. In addition, this HLPE report can contribute to the design of policies, initiatives and investments required to successfully implementing the Agenda 2030. It could lead to recommendations in connection with the various opportunities and challenges associated with the various forms of partnerships.

### **No duplication**

As mentioned, the proposed approach provides a different perspective and would contribute to bridge scientific discussions with the policy level. The report is not supposed to duplicate the relevant work done by other bodies and institutions given also the characteristics of this process, such as the inclusive and participatory research approach and the capacity of CFS to specify the areas it wishes to see addressed to maximise the relevance of the report for CFS work.

### **Knowledge and evidence**

There has been substantial research and a high number of country, regional and global initiatives focused on partnerships and financing mechanisms, particularly to inform the discussions leading to Agenda 2030. There is substantial evidence base to draw on.

### **Rome-based agencies support**

All the three RBAs are engaged on this theme, which represents a priority area of focus with major impact on their work. Moreover, all three have first hand experience with various forms of partnership programmes.

### **Available resources**

Extra-budgetary funding would be required – the HLPE is 100% voluntarily funded, through a Multi-Donor Trust Fund, at an average cost of \$1.4 million per year.

## **I. Food Safety**

The SDGs incorporate food safety into the targets yet the role of food safety has received startlingly little attention in the debates on food security, nutrition and health outcomes. Food safety has a tremendous impact on all three. CFS has the capacity to lend expertise and coherence to help reduce the harmful human and economic impacts of unsafe food. Nutrition-specific interventions, policies and programs throughout food systems - from production to consumption - cannot be achieved if food safety is compromised. Equally, overall food production is not sufficient if the food is not safe to eat.

This is based on SDG target:

*2.1 by 2030 end hunger and ensure access by all people, in particular the poor and people in vulnerable situations including infants, to safe, nutritious and sufficient food all year round.*

### **CFS value added and contribution to CFS objectives**

CFS has helped to advance the discussion of food systems, expanding the understanding that food production and nutrition are linked. Food safety is cited in the SDGs but has received relatively little attention compared to total caloric food security and to nutrition. Studies on the impact of food safety have been conducted, as well as standard setting, and measures to treat

food borne diseases. CFS can assist by reviewing interventions that can help to improve food safety with positive consequences on social, economic and environmental impact.

### **Relevance and global impact**

An estimated 600 million – almost 1 in 10 people in the world – fall ill after eating contaminated food and 420 000 die every year, resulting in the loss of 33 million healthy life years (DALYs). Children under 5 years of age carry 40% of the food borne disease burden, with 125 000 deaths every year. (source: WHO) Farmers who have product rejected due to food safety issues face loss of income and unsafe food creates a waste stream with environmental consequences.

### **No duplication**

Addressing the nexus of food safety, nutrition and health has not been addressed. While food safety standards are discussed at a global level, a discussion of the ways to improve food safety through interventions in production, storage, handling and consumption are not.

## **J. Resilient Agricultural Practices in the Context of Disasters**

The SDGs speak specifically to the challenges of climate change, extreme weather, drought, flooding and other disasters. CFS prepared the Framework for Action for Food Security and Nutrition in Protracted Crises. Yet, there has been little effort to co-ordinate focus on resilient agricultural practices to address agricultural needs in the wake of immediate crises such as droughts and floods. Food aid systems are vital at such times, however methods to resume farming, sustain livelihoods of smallholders, and reinvigorate food production systems are under explored.

This is based on SDG target:

*2.4 by 2030 ensure sustainable food production systems and implement resilient agricultural practices that increase productivity and production, that help maintain ecosystems, that strengthen capacity for adaptation to climate change, extreme weather, drought, flooding and other disasters, and that progressively improve land and soil quality.*

### **CFS value added and contribution to CFS objectives**

The UN system has a capable, robust system to respond to humanitarian food crises. The World Food Program and the rest of the UN system are continuously resourcing, improving and refining the response on an ongoing basis. Even in the face of growing demand and strains on resources. The Framework for Action for Food Security and Nutrition in Protracted Crises provides global guidance to respond to long term disruptions. It framed some of the most important measures to address the resilience and livelihoods of farmers and food systems in this context. In between these two contexts lies the response to building resilient agricultural systems in the face of disasters. The immediate needs of farmers, foresters, and fishers to replant, repopulate, and rebuild is acknowledged but is under-addressed in UN fora. The SDGs as the overarching framework,

specifically call out the need to address adaptation in the face of disasters and would be a meaningful contribution towards the SDGs.

**Relevance and global impact**

The El Nino effect has been yet another stark reminder of the impacts of extreme weather, drought, flooding and the long term implications of climate change on farming.

<http://www.fao.org/emergencies/resources/documents/resources-detail/en/c/411003/>

A broad array of countries have been affected this year, with a huge impact on livelihoods, food security, and the need for humanitarian assistance. These recent impacts bely a longer term trend toward more extreme weather and the need for more attention, coherence and analysis on these issues.

**No duplication**

While disaster response has received important and vital attention in UN fora such as Sendai, there has been very little focus specifically on the goals of including practices that increase capacity for adaptation to climate change, extreme weather, drought, flooding and other disasters. This would be a unique place where CFS could add value, drawing attention to the long term importance of resilience.